

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are amended, claims 12-23 are withdrawn, and claims 1-11 remain in the Application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject Application.

Examiner Communication

Applicant attempted to arrange an interview with Examiner Roche to discuss this Application. However, Applicant was informed that the Examiner is no longer employed at the Office and that there is no examiner currently assigned to this case. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office contact Applicant's undersigned representative to discuss this Application before issuing any subsequent rejections.

Specification

The Office has objected to the specification based on a typographical error. Applicant has provided an appropriate correction as indicated above and respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 2-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome these rejections and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

§ 101 Rejections

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly failing to recite statutory subject matter. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, Applicant has nonetheless amended claim 1 in the interest of expediting prosecution of this Application. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 101 rejections be withdrawn.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,364 to Bowman-Amuah.

Claims 7-9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious in view of Bowman-Amuah.

The Claims

Independent claim 1 is amended, and as amended recites a method for developing an application, comprising (added language is indicated in bold italics):

- providing an application framework including components that define a scope of the application, startup and shutdown behavior for the application, and how the application manages windows and resources;
- providing a navigation framework including components that provide navigation functionality, journaling, journal extensibility, and structured navigation;
- providing application lifecycle management components that define how the application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from a computing system;

- *providing a default set of permissions for the application, and if the application requires permissions beyond the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application; and*
- *launching the application.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Bowman-Amuah. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, Applicant has nonetheless amended the claim in order to expedite prosecution of this Application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Bowman-Amuah fails to anticipate claim one for at least the reason that Bowman-Amuah fails to disclose or suggest all of claim one's recited features. Specifically, Bowman-Amuah neither discloses nor suggests the feature of:

- *providing a default set of permissions for the application, and if the application requires permissions beyond the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application.*

This feature is missing from the cited reference. Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that Bowman-Amuah fails to anticipate claim one and that claim one is allowable.

Claims 2-6 and 10 depend from claim one and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which, in combination with recited in claim one, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the reference of record.

Claims 7-9 and 11 depend from claim one and thus include the features of that base claim. The Office has further rejected these claims as allegedly being obvious over Bowman-Amuah. However, as discussed above, Bowman-Amuah


fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim one. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 7-9 and 11 cannot be established based on this reference and these claims are allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Dated: 9-12-2007

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

David W. Foster
Reg. No. 60,902
(509) 324-9256 ext. 219